1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) proposes to construct a new five-story Central Health Services Center (CHSC) building and a new, 6,000-square-foot medical warehouse within the existing boundaries of San Quentin State Prison (SQSP) in Marin County, California. Marin County is in the San Francisco Bay Area north of the city of San Francisco. SQSP is bounded by Interstate 580 and the city of San Rafael to the north, U.S. Highway 101 and the City of Larkspur to the west, San Francisco Bay to the south, and the Richmond–San Rafael Bridge and the small private neighborhood of San Quentin Village to the east. The CHSC site is located in the eastern part of the SQSP property and the warehouse site is located in the center of the property.

The California Prison Health Care Receivership Corporation (Receivership) is responsible for establishing a plan for the restructuring and development of a constitutionally adequate medical health care delivery system for CDCR. The Receivership was established to fulfill court orders to improve care, oversee operations, and direct improvement in the quality of medical care for CDCR. The proposed project is one component of the plan. The primary goal of this proposed project is to create a clinical environment where health care professionals can provide improved medical care to inmate patients at SQSP. The Receivership has identified that a new, modern medical facility and adequate warehouse facilities are required at SQSP. As such, a new CHSC is proposed to provide adequate medical, mental health, and dental space at SQSP and a new warehouse is proposed to consolidate the storage of medical supplies in one place and in a facility that provides adequate climate control and security.

The new CHSC would include outpatient clinical services, specialty clinical services, licensed inpatient care, outpatient housing care, a pharmacy, medical records, medical administration, and support. All medical, mental health, and dental services currently provided in the existing Neumiller building and other smaller locations throughout SQSP would be relocated to the new CHSC. The Neumiller building would no longer be used for inmate care, but would be utilized for other existing support services. No additional inmate capacity would be created. Up to 75 new SQSP staff positions would be created.

The project is estimated to cost $142,900,000. The project would either be funded through the State general fund or through a funding mechanism to be established by the California State Legislature. Construction of the project is expected to begin October 2007 and would be completed in approximately 30 months.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-1, located at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the project, level of significance before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance after the application of mitigation measures.

1.3 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The extent of the geographic area that may be affected by implementation of the project varies depending on the resource under consideration. As discussed in Chapter 5, "Cumulative Impacts," of this DEIR, 36 projects are completed, under construction, approved, or are proposed in the project region, representing 800 new dwelling units and 1,411,214 square feet of commercial development. Additionally, CDCR approved the Condemned Inmate Complex (CIC) on the western portion of SQSP property, for which an EIR was prepared, as well as other minor projects (modifications to interior spaces, etc) that were exempted from CEQA because of their small size and lack of any impacts. The CIC would provide for more secure housing of current and future condemned inmates than the current SQSP facilities would; this project is being considered for funding by the State

Legislature. A discussion of impacts associated with cumulative development is provided in Chapter 5. For most impacts, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considerable with the exception of the following.

Air Quality

Although implementation of regionwide mitigation measures (recommended in the Air Quality Attainment Plan of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District) including programs to improve carpooling and ridesharing, would reduce the project's contribution to regional pollutant loads, the short-term project construction would contribute to the continued exceedance of state and federal ambient air quality standards for reactive organic gases, oxides of nitrogen, and particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter. No other feasible mitigation is available. This would be a cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact and the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Water Supplies

Without the Condemned Inmate Complex

Although cumulative water demands would be less than current water demands, the project would result in a net increase in water demands of 2.5 acre-feet per year (afy) over future, without project conditions, which would contribute to the further exacerbation of the Marin Municipal Water District's (MMWD's) operational yield shortfall. Therefore, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative significant impact on water supply. Because the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) is already installing flush valve control devices throughout the San Quentin State Prison (SQSP), no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable and the project's contribution would be considerable.

Because the project in combination with cumulative projects could contribute to the need for MMWD to construct new water supply facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts to several resources that may not be able to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the project's contribution to these impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

With the Condemned Inmate Complex

The Condemned Inmate Complex (CIC) project would result in a net increase in water demands by 186 afy (CDCR 2004). With implementation of flush valve control devices throughout SQSP, total water demands at SQSP with the Central Health Services Center (CHSC) and CIC projects would be 815 afy (2.5 afy for the CHSC, 186 afy for CIC, and 626 afy existing demand), which is substantially less than SQSP's contracted water entitlement with MMWD. Although cumulative water demands with the CIC project would be less than current water demands, the project would result in a net increase in water demands of 2.5 afy over without project conditions, which would contribute to the further exacerbation of MMWD's operational yield shortfall. Therefore, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact on water supply. Because CDCR is already installing flush valve control devices throughout SQSP, no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable and the project's contribution would be considerable.

Because the project in combination with cumulative projects including the CIC could contribute to the need for MMWD to construct new water supply facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts to several resources that may not be able to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the project's contribution to these impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

1.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include "areas of controversy known to the lead agency." The following issues, in no order of importance, are the controversial issues known to CDCR:

- Continued delivery of inadequate medical care to inmates at SQSP.
- Traffic congestion along local roadways.
- Removal of one of the oldest publicly-built buildings in the State.

1.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

1.5.1 NO PROJECT (NO DEVELOPMENT) ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative no actions would be taken at the project site. No development of the project site would occur and medical, mental health, and dental services would continue to be provided in substandard and constitutionally inadequate facilities. Existing health care facilities at SQSP would likely undergo minor upgrades within the existing facility footprint to the degree that upgrades would be feasible. These upgrades could include improvements to shower facilities, medical supply cabinets and storage facilities, and upgrades to electrical and plumbing infrastructure where feasible.

Under this alternative, health care services would very likely continue to fail to meet constitutional standards. As a result, it would be expected that the federal Receiver would reissue its mandate requiring CDCR to improve health care facilities at SQSP. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, healthcare services would likely continue to fail to meet constitutional standards for the foreseeable future.

Consistent with CEQA requirements, this No Project (No Development) Alternative is evaluated in this DEIR. The No Project (No Development) Alternative would not meet the project's basic objective to provide constitutionally adequate health care services at SQSP.

1.5.2 REHABILITATION OF THE NEUMILLER BUILDING ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, Neumiller Building would be seismically upgraded, renovated and expanded to provide for adequate and centralized housing of medical services at SQSP. Medical, mental, and dental health services are currently provided within the prison perimeter in limited facilities within the Neumiller Building, which is located at the southern tip of the prison, and in several substandard, makeshift clinic spaces in housing blocks and the gym. In response to the 1990 Earthquake Safety and Public Rehabilitation Bond Act, a seismic evaluation of the Neumiller Building determined that this building is classified as Seismic Risk Level V and would require substantial retrofit to meet current seismic safety standards. Extensive rehabilitation of the dilapidated Neumiller Building and additions to provide for sufficient building area would additionally be necessary. Further, the existing Neumiller Building is the subject of existing legal challenges regarding inadequate health care at SQSP.

To provide adequate medical services at SQSP, the Neumiller Building would need to house all health services at the prison and would need to be seismically retrofitted, renovated and the building would need to be expanded to provide adequate space for required medical services. Alternatively, the building would need to be demolished altogether, and rebuilt to meet the standards necessary to meet adequate medical care standards. Neumiller currently provides 68,800 square feet of space, in a configuration that is operationally inefficient. The programming for the project has determined a need for approximately 115,000 square feet of space, configured in an efficient flow. Therefore, Neumiller would require a substantial expansion, adding almost as much space as currently provided. This would be difficult to accomplish without demolishing Neumiller.

To accommodate these improvements, all existing services (e.g., medical, dental, mental health) would need to vacate the existing Neumiller Building and relocate to temporary space within SQSP. Currently, no space is available within the secure perimeter of SQSP. Besides there not being any space available to develop temporary facilities within San Quentin, attempting to develop such temporary replacement space, if any space were available would require extensive construction to comply with regulatory and code requirements for the operation of the spaces. Besides the outpatient clinic and clinical administrative support areas, Neumiller additionally houses many specialized medical functions that are not easily accommodated by standard building spaces and are specifically regulated by code and/or medical licensing requirements. These functions currently operate in undersized, non-conforming, non-licensable spaces due to the age and degradation of the existing facility which is the resulting purpose and need of this project.

Once relocated, even temporarily, these functions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with code and licensing requirements for which existing space, buildings, and infrastructure will be unable to accommodate. These specific functions include the trauma treatment area – emergency room (TTA), in-patient medical care, pharmacy, laboratory, and medical records. Development of temporary space that can accommodate these specialized requirements related to minimum space, structural code, emergency power, medical gases, ventilation, and security creates a substantial project unto itself with additional environmental impacts and could be considered cost prohibitive to develop such space types twice (i.e., temporary and permanent spaces).

At SQSP, space is limited because of the extensive facilities that are currently in place and the need to maintain programs and security requirements. CDCR is charged with providing a number of programs and services within each of its prison facilities. At SQSP, CDCR is required to provide adequate health care, access to legal services, recreation and yard space, housing, prison industry, and educational programs that meet CDCR's program standards. Each of these programs has minimum requirements for the type, location, and amount of space required to implement these programs. Details regarding these program requirements can be founds in the Design Criteria Guidelines, Standard Design Documents, Space Standards and site specific Architectural Program Reports. In some instances, space requirements are not currently being met for certain programs (e.g., education, yard space). Therefore, if the Neumiller Building were to be reconstructed, the temporary space required for the existing medical services that are offered in the Neumiller Building would need to be of adequate size, in close proximity to the existing inmate population (see project objectives), and would need to be temporarily located in an area that would not interfere with or reduce the existing space of any of SQSP's existing programs and services.

Building 22 is the only vacant building located in close proximity to the main prison population. However, this building could not temporarily support the medical services offered in the Neumiller Building because it has a higher (or worse) seismic rating than the Neumiller Building and has been determined to be unsafe for occupancy, in addition to its myriad of other problems, as discussed previously. No other vacant buildings are located at SQSP. Other on-site locations for new or temporary building construction were evaluated during the initial design and planning stages; however, based on a comprehensive review of these areas, none would meet the space, security, or functional requirements for either the short or long term. Therefore, it would be infeasible to relocate the existing medical services within the Neumiller Building to a temporary location at SQSP while still meeting constitutional standards for the provision of medical care and existing requirements and mandates for all other prison programs and services offered at SQSP.

1.5.3 CONSIDERATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project (No Development) Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project. It would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable historic structures, although these resources are likely to be severely damaged if an expected strong seismic event is experienced at the site. It would also avoid cumulative construction-related air quality, and cumulative water supply impact. This alternative would not attain any of the objectives of the project.

The Rehabilitation of the Neumiller Building Alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed project because it would not eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable air quality, water resources, and cultural resources impacts and it would result in one new potentially significant impact to views of the site from off-site areas. This alternative could meet all objectives of the project; however, this alternative would not be feasible to implement because no on-site space is available to temporarily house the medical services currently provided in the Neumiller Building while maintaining existing service levels for existing programs and services at SQSP.

The proposed project is the environmentally superior feasible alternative.

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1 VISUAL RESOURCES			
4.1-a: The project site is not visible from a designated State Scenic Highway and does not support any visually significant scenic resources (e.g., trees, rock outcroppings). As a result, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any such resources. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.1-b: The CHSC building would appear to be of similar size as adjacent existing prison facilities when seen from the Greenbrae boardwalk residential area. This building would not substantially alter the viewshed from the Greenbrae viewpoint because it would not interfere with the background ridgelines, would not block views of the undeveloped areas north of the site, would not alter the existing architectural features of SQSP, and would not alter the form or quality of the viewshed. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.1-c: The project would construct new facilities within the developed portions of SQSP. Although the CHSC building would be taller than the existing Building 22, it would not interfere with views of the San Quentin Ridgeline or the undeveloped hillside areas north of the site, and would not cause a substantial change in the views of SQSP. In addition, the CHSC building would be similar to surrounding buildings and would blend with the developed portion of SQSP. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.1-d: The proposed CHSC building would result in minor changes in the viewshed along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard as drivers approach from the east. There would be no changes to the foreground or middle-ground views, and changes to background views would be minor. The CHSC building would	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
block views of some of the existing buildings on-site; however, the views of the developed portion of SQSP would appear visually consistent. This is a less-than-significant impact.			
4.1-e: Because the project would not substantially alter nighttime lighting on the project site or from any of the surrounding viewpoints, nighttime light and glare impacts would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2 AIR QUALITY			
4.2-a: BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than requiring a detailed quantification of construction emissions. BAAQMD requires that all feasible control measures, which are dependent on the size of the construction area and the nature of the construction operations involved, will be incorporated into the project design and implemented during all construction activities. Because the required control measures are not currently incorporated as an element of the project, the short-term construction emissions could result in or contribute to a violation of the air quality standards. As a result, this impact would be potentially significant.	PS	In accordance with BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (BAAQMD 1999), the following mitigation, which includes BAAQMD-recommended basic, enhanced, and optional control measures, will be implemented to reduce construction generated emissions to a less-than-significant level. Implement the following measures to control emissions of fugitive dust: • Water all active construction areas at least twice daily or as often as needed to control dust. • Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. • Pave, apply water three times daily or as often as needed to control dust, or apply (nontoxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites. • Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites. • Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		• Hydroseed or apply (nontoxic) soil stabilizers or water to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). • Enclose, cover, water as needed, or apply (nontoxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) as needed to control dust. • Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. • Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways and to the bay. • Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible (if applicable). • Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph and dust is created. • Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time. Implement the following measures to control emissions of ozone precursors from mobile exhaust: • Use alternative fueled construction equipment. • Minimize unnecessary idling time (e.g., 5 minutes maximum when not engaged in work activities, including on-road haul trucks while being loaded or unloaded on-site.). In addition to the measures identified below, construction activities are also required to comply with all applicable BAAQMD rules and regulations, specifically Rule 8-3 regarding architectural coatings, Rule 8-15 regarding asphalt paving, Rule 11-2 regarding demolition, and Regulation 6 regarding particulate matter and visible emissions. • Pursuant to BAAQMD Rule 6, CDCR will ensure that emissions from all off-road diesel-powered equipment used on the project site do not exceed 40% opacity for more than 3 minutes in any 1 hour. Any equipment found to exceed	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		40% opacity (or Ringelmann 2.0) will be repaired immediately, and the construction contractor and BAAQMD will be notified within 48 hours of identification of noncompliant equipment. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment will be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results will be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary will not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary will include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed as well as the dates of each survey. BAAQMD and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. • Maintain properly tuned equipment. The construction contractor will provide a plan for approval by BAAQMD demonstrating that the heavy-duty (more than 50 horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, would achieve a projectwide fleet average 45% particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels (e.g., Lubrizol, PuriNOx, biodiesel fuel), engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (BAAQMD 1999), implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce air pollutant emissions from construction activities to a less-than-significant level.	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.2 b: Daily emissions of ROG, NOX, and PM10 would not exceed BAAQMD's significance threshold, and therefore would not result in or substantially contribute to a violation of the air quality standards or conflict with applicable standards and plans. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2-c: According to the traffic analysis prepared for the project, signalized intersections in the vicinity of the project site would be anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS with implementation of the proposed project (DKS 2007), or would not be deteriorated from acceptable LOS to unacceptable LOS under plus project conditions (DKS 2007). Thus, implementation of the project would not be anticipated to result in or contribute to local CO concentrations that exceed the California 1- or 8-hour ambient air quality standards of 20 parts per million (ppm) and 9 ppm, respectively. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2-d: Given that compliance with applicable standards are required for the construction and operation of land uses that may result in the emissions of TACs, the TAC emissions from the routine use of facilities in operations, both on and off the project site, are expected to be within established standards. As a result, stationary sources of toxic air emissions would be less than significant. However, the level of exposure of sensitive receptors to short-term construction-generated emissions of diesel PM is uncertain. Therefore, the short-term impact of TAC emissions associated with construction of the proposed project is potentially significant.	PS	Implementation of the above-recommended mitigation measures (under Mitigation Measure 4.2a), to minimize emissions of ozone precursors from mobile exhaust during construction, would also act to reduce TAC emissions associated with mobile exhaust during construction to the extent that impacts from TAC would no longer be significant. In addition to the measures listed above, CDCR will implement the following measure: • Staging areas and equipment maintenance activities will be located as far from sensitive receptors as feasible. Successful implementation of these measures would be expected to reduce emissions of diesel PM by approximately 95% (Vintz, pers. comm., 2006). The proposed measures, taken with the temporary nature of the on-site construction activities,	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		highly dispersive properties of diesel PM, and the fact that dispersion would be further enhanced due to wind currents from the San Francisco Bay, would substantially reduce concentrations of diesel PM. Thus, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.	
4.2-e: The project would not include the long-term operation of an odorous emission source; however, construction of the project would result in diesel exhaust emissions from on-site diesel equipment. Such emissions would be quite intermittent in nature and would dissipate rapidly from the source. In addition, mobile diesel equipment would only be present on-site temporarily during construction operations. Thus, the construction of the project is not anticipated to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors (i.e., prison employee residences or inmates) to an objectionable odor source. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.3 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
4.3-a: The project would not be incompatible with on-site or off-site land uses and would not result in any physical barriers that would divide an established community. Further, the project would not result in any changed land use conditions in San Quentin Village. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.3-b: There are no applicable environmental land use plans or policies of agencies with jurisdiction over the project. Further, the project would not be inconsistent with any land use plans or policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding environmental impacts. The project would therefore have a less-than-significant impact on land use plans and policies.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.3-c: There are no habitat conservation plans applicable to the project or project area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
4.4-a: The proposed project would require demolishing the majority of Building 22. The project would materially and adversely alter the physical characteristics of Building 22, which is eligible for listing on the CRHR. For this reason, the proposed project would have a significant impact on historic resources.	S	Under the proposed project, a major portion of Building 22, with the exception of the dungeon component, the original façade of the 1885 "new" hospital, and where feasible, the retention of the façade for Components A and B, would be demolished and removed. This would result in a substantial adverse change in a historical resource. This significant impact cannot be avoided. However, mitigation measures for reducing this impact have been developed and are being considered within the context of the design/build process. The feasibility of the specific mitigation measures described below will be assessed during project design and implemented based on the following criteria: • Ability to preserve the very significant, significant, and contributing elements of Building 22, as defined in the Historic Structures Report (Carey & Co. 2002); • The need to meet structural integrity and safety requirements related to the structural components of Building 22, including exterior facades; • The integration of historic preservation and reuse with the basic goals and objectives defined for the project; and • Financial impact to the State. • The following measures have been incorporated in the request for proposals (RFP) for the design/build process and will be implemented based on the criteria noted above: • Preservation and/or reuse of any historic items, relics, antiques, or similar objects of interest or value to the State	SU

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		that may be uncovered during demolition of Building 22. All such items will remain the property of the State. • Preservation or reuse of significant historic fabrics of Building 22. The proposed design of the new CHSC building will include specific historic elements of Building 22. The historic structures report for Building 22 (SQSP 2002) lists the very significant, significant, and contributing historic fabric elements of each building component. These lists will be referred to in determining the specific historic elements that will be incorporated into the design of the proposed building and/or removed for preservation to another building or location. The following elements will be preserved or reused: - Dungeon. The dungeon component will be preserved and will undergo minimal alterations for seismic retrofit to State Historic Building Code requirements for unoccupied space. The proposed CHSC will not penetrate or otherwise alter the existing dungeon space. - Hospital Façade. The existing eastern façade of the 1885 "new" hospital component will be preserved in place and will be incorporated into the exterior design of the new CHSC. - Façade of Components A and B. The eastern façade of building Components A and B located just north of the 1885 hospital contribute to the feel of a "village square" along the courtyard to the east of Building 22. Preservation of the historically significant elements of this façade will be incorporated, to the extent feasible, into the proposed project. The Historic Structures Report (SQSP 2002) indicates the eastern façade of Building 22 was the most significant character defining feature of Building 22; therefore, incorporation of the façade into the proposed	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		project would lessen the adverse effect of demolition of the rest of Building 22. If some or all of this façade cannot be preserved, then the proposed project will replicate the look and feel of this façade in the new building. The proposed project will also be sensitive to the wall and window detailing as currently expressed in the existing façade. The current building reads as a series of multiple buildings that are built in a row. The proposed project design will capture this feel in the new building. - Dedication Plaques. Two bronze dedication plaques currently located on Building 22 will be preserved in place with the existing façade as described above. If preservation of these two plaques is not possible, then they will be protected and salvaged for reuse in the proposed project. - Wall Murals/Paintings. One wall mural and two large-scale paintings are located in Building 22. The paintings will be protected and salvaged for reuse in the proposed project, but the mural is not feasible to preserve. - Library Roof Trusses. The library component of Building 22 features heavy timber wood trusses that are of historical significance. As part of the proposed project, these trusses will be protected and salvaged. If feasible, some or all will be incorporated into the proposed project • Design of the new CHSC will be sensitive to the historic values of Building 22 and will reflect the character of San Quentin State Prison in terms of scale, size, and color. Representatives of the Receivor shall direct the design team to implement architectural features that compliment the style of existing structures at SQSP. • If the eastern façade of Components A and B cannot be	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		preserved because of structural or operational infeasibility, recordation of the five building components that comprise Building 22 to the Level I standards of the Historic Architectural Building Survey and Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) (i.e., photographing the site and preparation of a report that documents the history of the building) will be conducted. • As requested by the SHPO on April 17, 2007, measured drawings for the HABS/HAER documentation would only be required if some or all of the eastern façade of Component A and Component B cannot be retained. If this façade can be preserved and incorporated into the proposed building, then a lower standard of archival documentation than HABS Level I would be required, and measured drawings would not be necessary. • The HABS/HAER documents will be submitted by CDCR to the OHP and to the local historic preservation society. The recommended mitigation would preserve historically significant elements of Building 22 to the degree it is feasible to do so, as well as appropriately document and record the conditions of Building 22. However, even with implementation of all of the above recommended mitigation, this impact would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level because a major portion of the historically significant building would be demolished. No other feasible mitigation is available. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.	
4.4-b: Because project-related construction activities could disturb previously unknown, buried important cultural resources, this would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	• If earthmoving activities during construction uncover historical features or artifacts, or unusual amounts of stone, bone, or shell, CDCR will stop potentially destructive work in the vicinity of the find and consult with a qualified archaeologist. The archaeologist will assess the find to determine if it is a historical resource or unique	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		archaeological site, and recommend treatment, as appropriate. CDCR will consult with the SHPO on the nature and treatment of potentially significant discoveries, and required treatment will be conducted before resuming construction at the site of the discovery. • If bone is uncovered and the bone appears to be human, California law requires that the County Coroner be contacted and the Native American Heritage Commission be notified if the remains are of Native American origin. Construction personnel will be alerted to the possibility of buried archaeological resources in the project area before construction activities begin, and will be educated as to identification of archaeological artifacts. With implementation of this measure, this potential impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.	
4.5 EARTH RESOURCES			
4.5-a: SQSP is not located in a designated Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, nor are any active faults identified on SQSP. Therefore, ground rupture would not be anticipated at the project sites. SQSP is located in an area subject to strong ground shaking (magnitude 7.1–7.9), which could result in severe structural damage. However, the California Building Code (CBC) includes design standards that are intended to protect buildings from the maximum credible earthquake that could occur on the site. Because the project would be designed in accordance with the most recent provisions of the CBC, including seismic design criteria for buildings, the project's seismic hazard impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.5-b: Liquefaction impacts at the warehouse site would be potentially significant because of its location in a very high liquefaction susceptibility zone. The CHSC is located outside the high liquefaction susceptibility zone, so liquefaction hazards at that site would be less than significant. Further, lateral spread impacts at both the CHSC and warehouse sites would be potentially significant because of the presence of clay, silt, and bay mud, which could be subject to lateral spread during a seismic event.	PS	CDCR will prepare additional design-specific geotechnical studies before preparation of final grading plans for the project (proposed CHSC and warehouse sites). These studies will further delineate the areas potentially subject to liquefaction and seismic-related ground failure and will include subsurface exploration, soil sampling, and laboratory testing of on-site earth materials. Buildings, facilities, or infrastructure proposed in these areas will conform to the design recommendations of the geotechnical engineer. Recommended geotechnical measures will address site grading, cut and fill, subdrainage, fill material quality, foundation type and design criteria, and other geotechnical measures. Measures to reduce liquefaction and ground failure impacts could include the construction of deep foundations, installation of driven piles, and extra reinforcement of foundation slabs. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	LTS
4.5-c: Because CDCR would be required to obtain and implement the actions in a NPDES permit from SWRCB, which identifies measures to prevent erosion impacts to the project site and San Francisco Bay, the project's erosion impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.5-d: The presence of weak, compressible, and clay soil that may be unsuitable for foundation support could result in structural damage to proposed facilities. Further, corrosive soils on the site could degrade steel and other metal materials. This would be a potentially significant soil hazard impact.	PS	CDCR will prepare design-specific geotechnical studies before preparation of final grading plans for the project. These studies will delineate areas on each project site that have compressible or corrosive soils. Facility designs will conform to the recommendations of the geotechnical engineer. The following grading and foundation measures could be implemented to reduce the project's compressible and corrosive soils impacts: • removal, conditioning, or treatment of compressible or unsuitable soils;	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		• importation or redistribution of clean fill materials suitable for reuse as engineered fill; • grading to provide suitably compacted soils to support planned building foundations, roadways and other structures; • construction of shallow, spread-type footings where bedrock is either exposed or confirmed to be at shallow depths (after grading); • structural reinforcement of building foundations; • construction of a structural mat foundation system as a possible alternative, if the lighter structures were designed as floating or partially compensated structures to minimize the bearing pressures on the subsurface soils; • application of protective coatings to steel bars to reduce the potential for corrosion; • selection of materials (e.g., PVC pipe, concrete mix designs) that are resistant to the corrosive soils and installation of cathodic protection systems to reduce or eliminate the potential for corrosion; and/or • use of a minimum three-inch concrete cover for construction in contact with native soils. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	
4.5-e: Because the SQSP site is relatively flat and is not located in a seismic hazard zone, landslide potential at the proposed project sites would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.5-f: Because the CHSC site would be located outside the tsunami wave runup zone (i.e., 15 to 20 feet above sea level), and the medical warehouse site will not be a habitable structure, the potential for tsunami inundation would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
4.6-a: Although it is not expected that construction workers would encounter soil or groundwater contamination during construction, workers could be exposed to hazardous materials present in Building 22 during construction activities (e.g., demolition grading, excavation, hauling building materials). Exposure to these hazardous materials (i.e., LBP, ACM, PCB's, and mercury) could create a significant environmental or health hazard to construction workers including increased risks for anemia, nerve disorders, and cancer; therefore, this would be a potentially significant hazard impact.	PS	• To avoid health risks to construction workers, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation will require the contractor to prepare a site health and safety plan. This plan will outline measures that will be employed to protect construction workers and the public from exposure to hazardous materials during remediation, demolition, and construction activities. CDCR will consult with the contractor to determine the measures to be employed at the site, which could include posting notices, limiting access to the site, monitoring the air quality, watering, and installation of wind fences. Development contractors will be required to comply with state health and safety standards for all demolition work, including compliance with OSHA and Cal/OSHA requirements regarding exposure to ACM and LBP. • In the event that contaminated soil is encountered, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation will prepare a site plan that identifies necessary remediation activities appropriate for proposed land uses, including excavation and removal of on-site contaminated soils, and redistribution of clean fill material on the project site. The plan will include measures that ensure the safe transport, use, and disposal of contaminated soil and building debris removed from the site. In the event that contaminated groundwater is encountered during site excavation activities, the contractor will report the contamination to appropriate regulatory agencies, dewater the excavated area, and treat the contaminated groundwater to remove contaminants before discharge into the sanitary sewer system. The development contractors will be required to comply with the plan; applicable local, state, and federal laws; and the	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		requirements of the Central Marin Sanitary Agency for dewatering discharge. The plan will outline measures for specific handling and reporting procedures for hazardous materials, and disposal of hazardous materials removed from the site at an appropriate off-site disposal facility. Analysis and mitigation measures addressing the potential release of hazardous materials into the atmosphere are addressed in Section 4.2, "Air Quality," of this DEIR. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	
4.6-b: Because construction contractors and SQSP personnel would be required to comply with all laws pertaining to the handling, transport, and storage of hazardous materials during construction and operation of the CHSC and warehouse, and these law would provide protection to on-site workers through implementation of safe handling practices, there would be a less-than-significant impact related to hazards to the public or the environment.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.7 HYDROLOGY, WATER QUALITY, AND SHORELINE RESOURCES			
4.7-a: The project would replace an existing building in the developed portion of SQSP and would construct a new warehouse in a previously developed (e.g., paved, covered) industrial area. The project would not result in any substantial changes to the existing drainage patterns at SQSP nor would it change the volume of stormwater generated at the site. Adequate capacity in existing SQSP drainage facilities would be available to convey project-related stormwater volumes. Impacts to the landscape and storm drainage components from the construction of this project would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.7-b: Because the project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain under all tidal conditions, and because adequate storm drainage facilities would be provided at the site, the project would not increase the potential for flooding on or off the project site. This would be a less-than-significant flooding impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.7-c: Project construction and operation activities could result in degradation of the quality of stormwater that enters San Francisco Bay. This would be a potentially significant water quality impact.	PS	CDCR will prepare and implement a SWPPP designed to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality through the construction and life of the project. The SWPPP will act as the overall program document to provide measures to mitigate significant water quality impacts associated with implementation of the project. The SWPPP will include specific and detailed BMPs required to mitigate potentially significant construction-related pollutants. These controls will include practices to minimize the contact of construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies (e.g., fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, adhesives) with stormwater. The SWPPP will specify properly designed centralized storage areas that keep these materials out of the rain. The SWPPP will specify a monitoring/inspection program to be implemented by the construction contractor and/or CDCR, and must include both dry- and wet-weather inspections. CDCR will conduct regular inspections to ensure compliance with the SWPPP. BMPs designed to reduce the amount of pollutants released during construction activities and to collect and properly dispose of pollutants before they can be carried into runoff will be developed and followed in accordance with the SWPPP. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.7-d: Because the project does not include clearing or converting undeveloped lands and no sensitive or other native vegetation exists on the project site, the impacts to vegetation would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.7-e: Wildlife habitats within the project site are very limited. However, because construction activities could result in contaminated runoff that in turn could affect wildlife habitats downstream, the project's impact on fish and wildlife species inhabiting the shoreline or waters downstream of the project site would be potentially significant.	PS	Potential effects to wildlife species could result from polluted stormwater and water quality degradation of downstream waters (San Francisco Bay) which provides suitable habitat for fish and wildlife species. Implementation of a SWPPP and BMPs designed to reduce impacts to water quality (see mitigation measure 4.7-c) would also reduce any potential water quality–related impacts to fish and wildlife species. Implementation of mitigation measure 4.7-c would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	LTS
4.7-f: The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special-status plants or animals. No suitable habitat for these species would be removed or otherwise affected because no habitat that supports these species is present on the project site. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8 NOISE			
4.8-a: Construction activities would result in a substantial (i.e., 3 dBA or greater) temporary increase in ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. However, construction activities would not occur during noise-sensitive time periods. As a result, construction-generated noise would be considered a less-than-significant short-term impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8-b: Increases in construction traffic attributable to the project would result in a negligible and imperceptible increase (i.e., less than 0.1 dBA) in noise. Increases in construction traffic noise would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.8-c: Groundborne vibration levels associated with construction of the project are not predicted to have PPV's exceeding current standards for human disturbance (Table 4.8-1) or structural damage. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8-d: Increases in vehicle traffic attributable to the project would result in a negligible and imperceptible increase (i.e., 0.3 dBA) in traffic noise and therefore would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8-e: Increases in stationary source noise attributable to the project would result in a negligible and imperceptible increase in noise. Therefore this impact would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8-f: Predicted ambient exterior and interior noise levels would not exceed the State recommended daytime or nighttime noise compatibility standards for prisons of 70 and 45 dBA Leq, respectively. The project will not affect the noise environment of the nearby residences (> 0.1 dB) and the noise environment will not affect the CHSC once it is completed. Therefore, this impact would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.9 EMPLOYMENT, POPULATION, AND HOUSING			
4.9-a: Implementation of the project would result in short-term construction jobs, permanent employment opportunities, and secondary employment opportunities in a region with a large labor pool. It is anticipated that the available workforce in the region and surrounding communities would provide a pool of employees that could adequately meet SQSP's proposed employment needs without resulting in substantial relocation of new residents to the region. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.9-b: Because project-related population growth would not stimulate any new development, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts, and the project-related population growth would be absorbed in growth projections of regional and local communities, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.9-c: Because no single county would receive a substantial number of new residents, and because the region offers a large housing base, the project would not substantially decrease the available housing stock in surrounding counties and would not result, in and of itself, in the construction of substantial new housing in the study area. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES			
4.10-a: Because the Sheriff anticipates that existing staff levels would be adequate to serve the project without affecting their ability to provide services elsewhere, and response times to the project site would not increase, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on law enforcement services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-b: Because the project would not substantially affect the SQSP fire station's ability to provide fire protection services at SQSP, and emergency response times would not substantially increase, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on fire protection services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-c: The project would improve medical services provided on-site and may reduce the number of inmates requiring emergency medical services, but the change in demand for off-site services is difficult to project, and is not likely to affect emergency services provided by off-site providers. The project would not exacerbate or substantially improve existing	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
emergency services provided by off-site providers; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.			
4.10-d: Wastewater flows related to the proposed project would not exceed existing available conveyance capacity of the SQSP pump station and the existing force main pipelines. Further, the CMSA WWTP is expected to have available capacity to treat project-related wastewater flows. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on wastewater facilities.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-e: Because SQSP would continue to take all measures to comply with existing monitoring requirements of CMSA and the RWQCB, and the project would not substantially change the characteristics of the wastewater conveyed to the CMSA WWTP, the project would have a less-than-significant-impact on wastewater quality.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-f: The project is estimated to increase water demands by 2.5 afy. Because this water demand would not exceed MMWD's threshold for a significant water supply impact (i.e., 100 afy), this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-g: Because the proposed project would not require upgrades to the existing water distribution system and would not adversely affect the provision of water to existing SQSP facilities, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-h: The existing water storage tank would provide adequate water storage for operational, fire, and reserve flows with implementation of the project. Further, the project would not increase the potential frequency of events requiring stored water. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect existing water storage facilities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.10-i: Because the project would not adversely affect landfill capacity, would not result in the construction of new solid waste disposal facilities, and would not impair waste management disposal services, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-j: Although the project could cause a slight increase in demand for electricity, the project's demands would not exceed existing available electrical supplies, and the project would not adversely affect PG&E's ability to provide electrical services to its existing customers. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on electricity services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-k: Although the project would cause a slight increase in the demand for natural gas supplies at the site, the project's demand would not exceed existing available supplies. Further, the project demand would be minimal compared to PG&E's capacity. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on natural gas services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-l: Although the project would cause a slight increase in electrical demand, no upgrades to existing electrical facilities or substations would be required. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-m: Because the project would not adversely affect the provision of natural gas services at SQSP, and existing capacity is available in PG&E's existing gas distribution line, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11 TRANSPORTATION			
4.11-a: With implementation of the project, all study intersections would operate at acceptable levels or under	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
significance thresholds of the jurisdictions in which the intersections are located. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant traffic impact.			
4.11-b: Project construction could result in up to 149 trips per hour which could substantially affect freeway operations as well as the operation of local roadway intersections, particularly the Anderson Drive/Sir Francis Drake Boulevard intersection (p.m. peak hour). This would be a significant construction-related traffic impact.	S	CDCR will prepare a construction traffic control plan to limit the arrival and departure of construction employees and vehicles during peak hours. At a minimum, for the majority of construction employees, arrival and departure schedules will be adjusted so the number of employees do not coincide with adjacent street peak hours (7:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m., and 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.). It is proposed that the majority of construction employees arrive by 5:30 am, well in advance of the morning peak, and that the departure hours are staged to avoid the afternoon peak. For those construction workers that would access the site, the plan will also identify the maximum number of construction vehicles that can enter and exit SQSP during morning and evening periods. The CDCR construction traffic control plan has established a threshold of 90 for the maximum number of AM peak-hour construction-related traffic trips and 74 for the maximum number of PM peak hour trips. Alternatively, CDCR could implement traffic control (i.e., flag person) at the intersection of Sir Francis Drake Boulevard/Anderson Drive, which would allow p.m. peak hour traffic to be increased to 90 vehicles. These peak-hour totals include any construction-related traffic trips that would coincide temporally with CIC project construction. Because peak hour construction related trips would be limited such that they do not exceed thresholds at which operational impacts to local roadways could occur, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.11-c: Because the project-generated transit trips would not be expected to substantially increase load factors on existing transit vehicles, this would be a less-than-significant public transit impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-d: Although the project would increase demands for parking by a maximum of 20 spaces, it is anticipated that the parking needs of the project would be accommodated in existing parking lots at SQSP. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-e: While 369 designated parking spaces would be available for construction vehicles during the project construction period, it is unknown whether all construction vehicles would be able to be accommodated on at SQSP in combination with other parking needs from existing operations. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	All parking will be accommodated on-site or at off-site areas designated for such uses (i.e., existing garages, lots). Construction employees will be instructed where acceptable SQSP designated parking facilities are located. If necessary, parking management practices such as valet or stacked parking on-site, or off-site parking with shuttles to and from the site will be implemented. Because designated parking for construction traffic will be provided, impacts related to parking would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.	LTS
4.11-f: Because the project would result in minor increases in vehicular volumes, the impact to site access and internal circulation would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS			
Visual Resources – without CIC			
The proposed CHSC building would result in minor changes in the viewshed from representative viewpoints; however, the CHSC would not substantially alter existing viewsheds. Because no other cumulative developments (without the CIC project) are located in close proximity to SQSP such that they	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
would cumulatively combine to result in significant visual impacts, cumulative visual impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be considerable.			
Visual Resources – with CIC			
Under cumulative conditions, the CIC project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the local viewshed. Because of the substantial size and mass of the CIC buildings, views of the CHSC buildings would not be available from representative viewpoints. While overall cumulative visual impacts would be significant and unavoidable, the project's contribution to this cumulative visual impact would not be considerable.	SU Cumulative Impact	No feasible mitigation is available.	Not cumulatively considerable
Air Quality – without and with CIC			
Although implementation of regionwide mitigation measures (recommended in the BAAQMD Air Quality Attainment Plan), including programs to improve carpooling and ridesharing, would reduce the project's contribution to regional pollutant loads, short-term project construction would contribute to the continued exceedance of state and federal ambient air quality standards for reactive organic gases, oxides of nitrogen, and PM10. No other feasible mitigation is available. This would be a cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact and the project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.	SU Cumulative Impact	No feasible mitigation is available.	Cumulatively considerable
Air Quality – without and with CIC			
Because the project would not result in a substantial net increase in GHG emissions, the project would not result in a considerable incremental contribution to global climate change.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Land Use – without and with CIC			
The project would not result in any land use compatibility impacts and would be consistent with relevant policies of state and local jurisdictions. Cumulative land use impacts would be less than significant because cumulative projects would comply with local policies and plans for development and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Cultural Resources – without CIC			
Although the CHSC project would result in a significant impact to known important cultural resources (Building 22), this would be a site-specific impact and would not combine with any other cultural resources impacts associated with other cumulative developments (without the CIC project) such that it would result in cumulatively significant cultural resources impacts. The cumulative cultural resources impacts would be less-than-significant.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Cultural Resources – with CIC			
The CIC project would not result in any significant impacts to historic resources. Although the project would result in a significant impact to known important cultural resources (Building 22), these impacts are site specific and would not combine with impacts associated with other cumulative development or the CIC such that it would result in cumulatively significant cultural resources impacts.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity			
The project would not combine with any other projects to create cumulative impacts to geology, soils, and seismicity. Cumulative geology, soils, and seismicity impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Hazards and Hazardous Materials – without and with CIC			
Because CDCR has committed to implementing mitigation that would reduce the project's site specific hazards and hazardous material impacts to a less-than-significant level, and the project would not result in impacts that would combine with cumulative development, including the CIC project, cumulative hazards and hazardous material impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Hydrology, Water Quality, and Shoreline Resources			
Because the CDCR would implement mitigation to reduce the project's stormwater quality impact to a less-than-significant level, and other cumulative developments would be anticipated to implement similar water quality protection measures, impacts on cumulative hydrology, water quality, and shoreline resources would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Noise – without CIC			
The project plus cumulative development (without the CIC project) would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on traffic noise or increases to sensitive receptors along local roadways. Further, the project would not cumulatively combine to result in significant cumulative construction-	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
related noise impacts. Therefore, the cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be considerable.			
Noise – with CIC			
The project plus cumulative development including the CIC would not result in cumulatively considerable traffic noise impacts increases to sensitive receptors along local roadways. Further, the CHSC and CIC project are sufficiently distant from other cumulative development such that they would not cumulatively combine to result in significant cumulative construction-related noise impacts. Therefore, the cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Employment, Population and Housing – without CIC			
Because the project would not cause substantial in-migration of workers or residents to the project area and the project-related population growth would be absorbed into the region, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable contribution to population, employment and housing impacts.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Employment, Population and Housing – with CIC			
Because the CIC project alone would not result in the stimulation of new development, and because the project and other cumulative development plus the project also would not stimulate new development that would result in significant environmental impacts, the cumulative employment and population growth impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Public Services (Police and Fire) – without and with CIC			
Because the project would not increase demand for police and fire services above existing conditions, and local police and fire agencies would be able to meet cumulative demands, cumulative police and fire impacts would be less-than-significant, and the project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Public Services (Wastewater) – without and with CIC			
Project-related wastewater flows would not exceed existing available conveyance capacity of the SQSP pump station and the existing force-main pipelines. Further, the CMSA wastewater treatment plant is expected to have available capacity to treat cumulative wastewater flows, including the CIC. Therefore, cumulative wastewater impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Public Services (Water Supply) – without CIC			
Although cumulative water demands would be less than current water demands, the project would result in a net increase in water demands of 2.5 afy, which would contribute to the further exacerbation of MMWD's operational yield shortfall. Therefore, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant water supply impact. Because CDCR is already installing flush valve control devices throughout SQSP, no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable and the project's contribution would be considerable.	SU Cumulative Impact	No additional feasible mitigation is available.	Cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Public Services (Water Supply) – without CIC			
Because the project in combination with cumulative projects could contribute to the need for MMWD to construct new water supply facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts to several resources that may not be able to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the project's contribution to these impacts would be cumulatively considerable.	SU Cumulative Impact	No additional feasible mitigation is available.	Cumulatively considerable
Public Services (Water Supply) – with CIC			
Although cumulative water demands with the CIC project would be less than current water demands, the project would result in a net increase in water demands of 2.5 afy, which would contribute to the further exacerbation of MMWD's operational yield shortfall. Therefore, the project would result in a considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant water supply impact. Because CDCR is already installing flush valve control devices throughout SQSP, no other feasible mitigation is available to reduce this impact. Therefore, this cumulative impact would be significant and unavoidable and the project's contribution would be considerable.	SU Cumulative Impact	No additional feasible mitigation is available.	Cumulatively considerable
Public Services (Water Supply) – with CIC			
Because the project in combination with cumulative projects including the CIC could contribute to the need for MMWD to construct new water supply facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts to several resources that may not be able to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the project's contribution to these impacts would be cumulatively considerable.	SU Cumulative Impact	No feasible mitigation is available.	Cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Electricity and Gas – without and with CIC			
Because the project would only cause a slight increase the demand for electricity and natural gas on-site and would not adversely affect PG&E's ability to provide electricity and natural gas to the service area, cumulative electrical and natural gas impacts would be less than significant.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Transportation/Traffic – without CIC			
Cumulative traffic impacts would be less-than-significant and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable because adequate parking would be provided on- and off-site, construction workers trips would be restricted to maintain peak-hour traffic conditions at local intersections, adequate parking would be provided on-site for new employees, the project would not substantially increase demands for public transit, no internal traffic circulation hazards would occur, and local intersections would not degrade to unacceptable operating levels or exceed established thresholds for intersections that operate unacceptably.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Transportation/Traffic – without CIC			
Because area roadways would operate acceptably or the project would not result in an increase in traffic levels that exceed operating thresholds, no significant cumulative transportation impacts would occur (with the CIC project) and the project's contribution to this impact would not be considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Transportation/Traffic – with CIC			
Cumulative construction-related impacts on traffic (with the CIC project) would be less-than-significant because the project and CIC project would implement mitigation to ensure that existing service levels would be maintained at local intersections and roadways. Therefore, while the project's contribution to cumulative construction-related impacts on traffic would be considerable, no significant cumulative construction-related impacts on traffic would occur.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No further mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Transportation/Traffic – with CIC			
Cumulative construction-related parking impacts (with the CIC project) would be significant because the project and CIC project would require more parking that is available for construction employees. CDCR will implement mitigation to provide adequate off-site parking and busing of workers from the parking area to the site, if needed. Therefore, while the project's contribution to cumulative construction-related parking impacts would be considerable, no significant cumulative construction-related parking impacts would occur.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Transportation/Traffic – with CIC			
Because the CHSC and CIC projects would only increase demand for parking at SQSP by 18 spaces and a total of 369 spaces would be available under worst-case conditions, cumulative operational parking impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Transportation/Traffic – with CIC			
Because the project in combination with the CIC project would not substantially increase transit load factors, cumulative transit impacts would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable
Transportation/Traffic – with CIC			
Because the project in combination with the CIC project would not substantially increase the number of additional peak-hour vehicles entering and exiting the site, no significant site access, safety, or circulation issues would occur and the project's contribution to this impact would not be considerable.	LTS Cumulative Impact	No mitigation is necessary.	Not cumulatively considerable

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable